

## REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Final Office Action dated March 26, 2007, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on June 26, 2007. Claims 1-20 have been examined. The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 6-14, and 16-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Takeuchi, US 6,646,317, in view of Bischel, US 5,513,196. The Examiner rejected claims 5, 15, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Takeuchi, Bischel, and "Packaging Relaxed Semiconductor Lasers with Diluted Waveguide Structure" by Choa, et al., published by IEEE in 1994.

### Statement of Substance of Interview

On May 22, 2007, a telephonic interview was held between Walter C. Grollitsch, attorney of record, and the Examiner. The parties discussed the cited reference Bischel, US 5,513,196. Claim 1 was also discussed.

As discussed during the interview, the convex integrated lens "510" in Bischel is positioned in the device such that the planar face of the lens is the input face rather than the convex portion of the lens. The arguments herein are presented in accordance with the substance of the interview to place the application in better condition for allowance.

### Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 11, and 16 as being obvious over Takeuchi in view of Bischel. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1, 11, and 16 because the Examiner did not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the references when combined must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Claims 1, 11, and 16 include the limitation of a waveguide having one end coupled with a convex (or a cylindrical diopter) input face of the component to receive an input wave. The combination of Takeuchi and Bischel does not teach this limitation. As admitted by the Examiner in the Office Action, Takeuchi fails to disclose an input face that is convex. As such, the Examiner appears to rely on a convex integrated lens "510" of Bischel to teach an input face that is convex. However, Bischel also fails to disclose that the input face is convex. As clearly shown in Figure 9 of Bischel the convex integrated lens "510" is positioned

in the device such that the planar face of the lens is the input face rather than the convex portion of the lens. In fact, Bischel clearly states that the lens is positioned such that “the light propagating in the planar waveguide is phase shifted by the integrated lens 510 so as to produce a concave, converging phase front (in the horizontal plane) after traversing the lens” (see Bischel, col. 20, lines 58-60). Therefore, Bischel fails to cure the deficiencies of Takeuchi.

As the forgoing illustrates, that combination of Takeuchi and Bischel fails to disclose all the limitations in claims 1, 11, and 16. This failure precludes the combination of Takeuchi and Bischel from rendering claims 1, 11, and 16 obvious. Applicants therefore submit that claims 1, 11, and 16 are in condition for allowance and respectfully request withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection. Additionally, since claims 2-4 and 6 depend from claim 1, claims 12-14 depend from claim 11, and claims 17-19 depend from claim 16 and these claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as claims 1, 11, and 16.

The Examiner rejected claims 5, 15, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Takeuchi, Bischel, and “Packaging Relaxed Semiconductor Lasers with Diluted Waveguide Structure.” Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Claim 5 depends from claim 1, claim 15 depends from claim 11, and claim 20 depends from claim 16 and as set forth above, the combination of Takeuchi and Bischel fails to teach or suggest all the limitations in claims 1, 11, and 16. Further, “Packaging Relaxed Semiconductor Lasers with Diluted Waveguide Structure” fails to cure the deficiencies of the combination of Takeuchi and Bischel. This failure precludes the combination of Takeuchi, Bischel, and “Packaging Relaxed Semiconductor Lasers with Diluted Waveguide Structure” from rendering claims 5, 15, and 20 obvious. Applicants therefore submit that claims 5, 15, and 20 are in condition for allowance and respectfully request withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection.

***Conclusion***

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the case is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions, please contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,



Walter C. Grollitsch  
Registration No. 48678  
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.  
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500  
Houston, TX 77056  
Telephone: (713) 623-4844  
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846  
Attorney for Applicants